

REMARKS

Prior to examination per the accompanying Request For Continue Examination, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the application. Claims 1-34 have been canceled and new claim 35-77 have been added. Claims 35-77 are now pending in the application.

In paragraph 1 on page 2 of the final Office Action, claims 21, 22 and 24-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as including limitations lacking antecedent basis.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections. Nevertheless, the cancellation of claims 1-34 and the addition of new claims 35-77 render the rejection moot.

In paragraph 3 on page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 4-22 and 24-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Treseder and Official Notice regarding well-known use of materials recited in the claims.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Office Notice and the rejections. Accordingly, Applicants, in accordance with MPEP § 2144.03, request the Examiner to cite a reference in support of the Official Notice that it is well known to provide the elements recited in Applicant's claims yet missing from Treseder. In particular, the Examiner is requested to provide evidence that discloses all of the limitations of the claims, and that provides motivation for modifying any reference or for combining references.

MPEP § 2144.03 indicates that allegations concerning specific knowledge of the prior art...should be supported and the applicant should be given the opportunity to challenge the correctness of such assertions and allegations. The facts so noticed serve to "fill the gaps" which might exist in the evidentiary showing and should not comprise the principle evidence upon

which a rejection is based. MPEP § 2144.03, citing *In re Ahlert* 424 F.2d 1088, 1091, 165 USPQ 418, 420-421 (CCPA 1970).

With regard to Treseder, applicants respectfully submit that Treseder fails to disclose, teach or suggest the limitations recited in new claims 35-77.

Treseder discloses a disk file comprising a spindle motor, spindle, disks coupled to the spindle and an actuator assembly. The disk file is secured at either end of a “can” and a connector is provided at one side of the can. The can is hermetically sealed using a double-seamed visco-elastic seal for attaching the two can portions.

Treseder fails to suggest an eutectic aluminum alloy housing comprising two sides, a bottom and a connector opening in the bottom of the housing. Treseder fails to suggest fasteners disposed along the inside bottom of the housing for fastening a hard disk drive assembly only to the bottom of the housing without creating an opening in the housing. Treseder fails to suggest a multi-pin feedthrough disposed within the connector opening in the bottom of the housing, the multi-pin connector comprising a flange having a plurality of signal pins being disposed within openings therein, wherein ceramic beads seal the openings between the signal pins and the flange. Treseder teaches away from providing a coalesced metal joint to securing a feedthrough to the opening of the housing. Treseder fails to suggest a first lid disposed over the hard disk drive assembly and coupled to a flange in the side walls of the housing via a non-hermetic seal, a pressure sensitive adhesive disposed over the first lid and a second lid disposed over the first lid, the second lid being engaged by the pressure sensitive adhesive disposed over the first lid, the second lid having a thickness less than a thickness of the first lid and having a low solidification temperature and a high cracking resistance. Treseder uses a double-seamed visco-elastic seal rather than a laser weld to seal the container. Nevertheless, Treseder fails to suggest a laser weld

formed between the second lid and the housing along the periphery of the second lid, the laser weld providing a second hermetic seal.

Accordingly, Treseder fails to disclose, teach or suggest nearly every element recited in Applicants' claims, and thus the invention, as recited in the newly added claims, is patentable over Treseder and any Official Notice.

On the basis of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of this application and its allowance are requested.

If a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any issues concerning this communication, please contact Attorney for Applicant, David W. Lynch, at 423-757-0264.

Respectfully submitted,

Chambliss, Bahner and Stophel
1000 Tallan Building
Two Union Square
Chattanooga, TN 37402
423-757-0264

By: _____

Name: David W. Lynch

Reg. No.: 36,204